

8/9/67

Dear Paul,

Your very interesting letter of 8/6 raises a number of things of interest and some that are feedback of my own, uncredited work used by others.

Most of all, at the moment, I am quite interested in what CBS attributed to Alvarez but which, in its entirety, not just the Frame 190 staff, it knew about earlier from me. It was determined not to credit me. I can prove they had my stuff and that they knew this was in it, for they credited one part of "one critic". I may be wanting to do something about CBS, hence everything on, about or from Alvarez, who I presume to be honorable, is of great interest and I'd like all of it, even if inaccurate.

Hal is right. Add to that that I am much more tired than ever. So I will not take time to search out references. My guess is that the second "Alvarez" camera shake I go into at several points in WWII, beginning about pp 212-3 and about six of seven pages later. The 227 is specific. Ray argued the meaning of it with me. I think he says Connally was hit there. Alvarez failed to note 222, where it is also true. The interesting thing, as CBS has not responded about, is that there are about a half-dozen such points, not just the three Alvarez talks about. I have other, unpublished material on this I'd prefer not to go into here. I'll do something with it soon. A sound, etc., could have started the oscillations.

Even the pinpointing of Frames 185-6 is not Alvarez's but mine (WW48). I think it is likely there could have been an even earlier Zapruder reaction, say of about 5 cycles per second. If the oscillation were visible, it would be a plitude over several cycles since the camera was held still. I can send them to someone who is interested in this and who thinks he may be able to do something for me about it.

a CBS vice president. Also, I want to make the only outgoing mail, leaving in a few minutes.

I am quite interested in any alternative or suggestion of anything except the compare quantitatively the two cameras. During the first few frames of the other known shots, I think this is probably mentioned vaguely

that I alone seem to have discovered. You will find the first mentioned in the film, so just before publication I went over

the ms and weakened this point to have to say merely that the heads move in both directions in disconnected motions. The first is short, sharp and forward; the to the shots of Kennedy and Connally. It is really like what Alvarez has. The

second (313) violently backward. It is really like what Alvarez has. The but he did not mention it. The absence of a single frame here could be crucial. Frame 315 in, the 316 does. It is still

mislabelled, even though I called it to official attention last year. of shock waves, and the "Monarch cock" is of great interest. Give you a copy or lend me

yours? I can't speak for the cops or Quiroga, although I imagine the cops thought

Uswald what they call "Red". But Bringier is pure nut, the only thing you're

about him. His case against me was tossed out of court a week ago today. He

alleged my correct quotation of his own testimony deformed him. He is right of

radical right, close to "argie". If you can spare a copy of that "Emparts" piece,

(I think that it had all been claimed to have located the fatal shot more accurately than the connection with the question of the speed at which the car came)

one of my leads. They wanted professional help. Turner kept all of it, not even telling me what he learned! That is the "inuteman, Gabaldon stuff. The guy we

took him to phoned me from "alif. and I referred to Bill. I believe "Panister was connected with the Anti-Communist League of the Caribbean...My phrase for

Shaw is "mother hen", very similar to the Remparts "babysitter"....True about

Novel on NBC payroll 2/1. NYTimes had man down there at latest in November. Investigation began 10/66. I knew about it 1/1. He has gone back to N.O. I gather

from Alcock he'll sing...If Bringier is a nut, the others need not be.